L.R

(1891-92)

18291

119

Subr. Appeal of Shastha Rao
Claiming for the Shanbhogs
of Gangamahalli village
Sorab Taluk —

P. J. 1597 92. 93.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

L.R. 38 of 1885-

1891-92

192- .

(L. R.)

File No.

Serial Nos.

Later references.

L.R. 987 of 1898.

L.R. dept'l 0/1397-22

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 - 9

Major **Part B for** June 1892.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Chanduka Rao Claim for the Chandraji Pice of Gangawali Village, North Kanara.

Typed

To the Deputy Commissioner, [illegible]
No 20581, Dated [illegible].
P. J. 159-92

Read.

Letter from the appellant Chandraji Rao dated again as the Chandraji Gangawali Village.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Considered
A. Scott

1-26 [illegible]

appl no 184 of 1891-92

appl

Lankowamma
of Gangavalli
South Salem
Shemoga Dt.
represented by
Mr Venkatramma
advocate

Respt

1. Ramachandra
2 Dattappa, sons
of the 1st Respt

represented by
Mr Venkatramma advocate

The virtually
There is an appeal against the order
of the Asst Comr dated April 1889. but the appeal
was admitted as it follows explained that
he was not aware (till today) of the contents
of the order of 1887 that passed
in 1887 under which the Asst Comr passed the
order now appealed against.—

The facts of the case are briefly as follows.

The appl & the 2d Respt are brothers, the 2d Respt being
the elder of the two. On the death of their father
in 1878, the 2d Respt requested that his younger
the appl, might be appointed to the office, & the appl
was accordingly appointed to the post in 1879. At request of the
2d Respt as an witness & the admits that he signed
the statement. In 1888, the 2d Respt requested
that the office might be registered in the name of

Accordingly, the 1st Respt, & the said Court issued an order accordingly on 1889, but directing the appln to act as guardian for the 1st Respt as he was a minor. He moved the order with reference to a Bombay Pro ruled 6/12/87 which laid down the principle that when Hindu Kolaru appoint guardians for any of the ward ages of their circles, they are liable to be removed at the instance of the Hindu Kolaru after a period of 5 years—

In 1891, appellant appealed against the above order to the Dy Collector & the appeal was rejected on the ground that the appeal was too late, & the present appeal is against the order—

The Govt observe that the Bombay Pro

of 1887 does not at-all apply in the present case. Appt was not appointed as a gumasta ~~[illegible]~~ He has as good a right to the office as the 2nd Respt & he was appointed to the office unconditionally. The appointment of the 1st Respt, ten years after the appt was appointed & the post is unpensionable. The order issued by the Asst Comm. therefore cancelled. The appt should be registered again as the shanbhog of the village

23/5/93

Asst

appt is referred to the Dy Comr who has been requested to register appt as the shanbhog of the village.

4

Assistant Commr's order No. 52 dated 7th April to the Amildar.

As by the Commr's Proceedings No. 5233-46, the registry of the Khanderpeeship in the Ramachandrapha name seems proper, it must be registered, and as Ramachandrapha is a minor the present incumbent Ramlay Shirish must be appointed as his Gomasta till he attains the age of discretion.

Deputy Commr's order No. 896 dated 20th January 91, to the Amildar.

This informs the Amildar that as the above order has not been appealed against and has been allowed to stand, the Khanderpeeship cannot be registered in the petitioners name. If the Petitioner is willing to act as Gomasta the election may be made. Otherwise it is not necessary to do so.

x/ As recommended by the Amildar

1. Stamp Correct.
2. Appeal in time.
3. Copies of Orders produced.
4. C.C. (1) Rule I of the Council Rules

Admitted to the Council.

18/2/92

(Letter further -)

Admit
Collr's Rep. wd
Enq. Issue.
21/
18/2
Enquired
22/2/92

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

No. 3077

Name of Petitioner.

Ramlingha Naik

Village.

Quembavalli

Taluk.

Salsette

District.

Thanna

Date of Arzi. 14—1—92

Date of Receipt. 8—2—92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

The Khanderogeen of the ab
village died in the year
leaving issue, namely the
petitioner and his brother
Dattapya. of Dattapya
had a Khanderogeeship in
Shikarpur Inam the
deposed before the mamlat
that his father's Khandoge
might be restored to the
petitioner and the Patte
Settlement Officer acc
-ingly registered it in the
petitioner's name on 1 [illegible]
April 1879.

But some years after wa
the said Dattapya, being dese
-rous of having the Sa[illegible]

amboqueship registered
in Ramachandrapéte
me, submitted a petition to (to the District authorities ??
Court and the Assistant-
Commr (Amnaga District)
aging upon Government
ceedings No 5253 of 1897
ded that "the Ramachandrapéte
ot be registered in the name of
rmachandrapéte, Ramaya
eddar, Ramiragadu, and as
is a minor the petitioner must be
appointed as Guardian".
Sd/ the petitioner submitted
t the above proceedings only
olicit Strangers from
etting into Fundamental Post and
not meant to act against
Reddis. The petitioner is a
Reddi and therefore it is
r order to apply the above
roceedings to his Case.
The Case being represented to
e Deputy Commr by an appli-
cation, he dismissed the Case on
the ground that the Petr did not appeal
against the above order.—
Therefore he prays that the
ecords may be called for and referred
and justice may be done by
restoring him the said Ramachandra-
Ship.

v Put up.

Vide Assistant Commr No 52

Vide Deputy Commr's order

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 3077
DATE 15-1-92

133

17-4-89

133

No. 72 K.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 3077

dated 11th January 1892 received at the Dewan's Office from Shanbhoga Rao, Shanbogue of Gangavalli Circle, Sora Taluk

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga with reference to his Proceedings with a brief precis.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
18/2/1892.

Chief Secretary.

From the same No. 17/11/37

Confirmed 24/2/1892

Petn Dept to Mysore 6/4

Shambhoji Case

Submitted to the Council = Mysore 12/4

12/4/92

(General Serial No. 30.)

P. 1 132 10 APR 92

1892.

From

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
Dated
SHIMOGA DISTRICT

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 4th
Despatched
Received 2 April

Enclosures No. 4 with Record

General No. 17
No. 11

Sir

I have the honour to forward herewith a Petition from Shambhoji Rao, with its 2 enclosures for submission to Government with a brief Precis.

With reference to the above I have the honour to forward the Records of the case with a Precis thereof.

2. The Petitioner

A
7-4-92

I [illegible] with the enclosures
to Lieutenant Colonel

No. 2344

Applicant.

Shantayya Ry,
Shanbhogue of Jangamakote
Circle, Sidlaghatta Taluk.

Issued
18/4/92

Endorsement.

In reply to his Petition dated 17th January 1892.

Petitioner is required ~~informed that he should~~ to submit an explanation as to why he did not appeal to the Dy: Comm^r against the Asst Comm^r's order within the prescribed time.

B.M.
15/4

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

15/4—1892.

By Order,

Draft

Commissioner.

for Chief Secretary. 15/4/92

Mysore Government Central Press Bangalore.—28-9-91—1000.

V
13/Judge

20

The appellant was called upon to explain why he did not appeal in time (Please see order on English memo put up)

Petitioner admits delay on his part. The explanation furnished does not appear to be satisfactory. Orders solicited as to whether the appeal should be admitted.

Submitted to Hon'ble Council —

K
23/6/92

(General Serial No. 32.)

14 189

No. 807

Name of Petitioner. Shantappa Rao Shankapur of

Village. Gangavalli Circle

Taluk. Sorab

District. Shimoga

Date of Arzi. 2.6.92

Date of Receipt. 10.6.92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One.

ABSTRACT.

With reference to the office index [illegible] requiring Petr to explain why he did not appeal to the Dy: Comm^r against the order of the Asst Comm^r within the prescribed time, Petitioner submits the following explanation:—

Section [illegible] Inam Abolition Act order of the investigation of [illegible] the name of Ramachandra Rao Petr's brother was

in the Shenbagam, Barnard for Petitioner, and this fact was communicated to Petitioner's Pleader in writing by letter dated 15th September 1934. This was stated in the petition that the aforesaid substitution had been made under Patent Proceedings No 335/133 (no date), Petitioner brought that order and been issued from this office, and wanted explanation from this fact he case settled, but he could not do so, giving frivolous statements. Petitioner obtained copies of the order and found that the name, as entered in the deed is 339 and that it had been wrong in his case. Therefore he applied to the Registrar, Commissioner rejected the appeal as time-barred. Hence the appeal to this office.

807R.

10-6-92

ಸೇವೆ

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಭಿನಂದನೆಗಳು.

ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾಪಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಮರಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿನಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಯಿತ

ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿ

ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 1 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1000 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ಮಶಾನಕ್ಕೆ 10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕಾಯ್ದಿರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಸ್ಮಶಾನದ ಸುತ್ತಲೂ ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸ್ಮಶಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಸ್ಮಶಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತ ರೂ. 10 ಲಕ್ಷಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಸಹಕಾರದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 1 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1000 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ಮಶಾನಕ್ಕೆ 10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕಾಯ್ದಿರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಸ್ಮಶಾನದ ಸುತ್ತಲೂ ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸ್ಮಶಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಸ್ಮಶಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತ ರೂ. 10 ಲಕ್ಷಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಸಹಕಾರದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Durbar of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr,
Shimoga Dt

Dated 14
Despatched 15 } Sept 1892.
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 4311.
Pers. No. 159-92

Calling for the Register
of Births, Deaths, Settlement
Fee Agency Circle,
Sirsi Taluk, Kanara Dt.

References to be marked.

To the Deputy Comm.r of
Chingford.

Sir, I have received the
[illegible] communication, accompanied by the application, petition and certificate of Emma Ann Stevens of Chingford, Spinster.

I beg to enclose the above documents and to request that I may be informed will submit the original Register to the Registrar at the Registrar's Office, Walthamstow, made in 1879.

Yours truly,

Clerk

(Coroner's Duty)

Date 14/9/92

for Clerk of Peace

W. H.

1892 21

From

The Deputy Commissioner

Shimoga District

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Govt of Mysore.

Dated 22nd September 1892

R/o [illegible]

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith Settlement Register of 1878-79, Vol: III of the Tirthahalli Taluk, and to solicit reference to Serial No 86.

The Register may kindly be returned when no longer required.

for Deputy Commissioner

Shim

Pet: File 159-92

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE
1892. 3372.
13 SEP 92
12/5/158

From The Deputy Land Commissioner
Wanganui District

To The Chief Secretary to the
Native Office

Dated 22 September 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 Register

General No. 635

No. 889

With reference to the Agent's
No. 431 dated 4th instant
159
forwards the Settlement
Register of 878-79, 880
of the Land Claims and
solicits reference thereto
No 86.

Peter Buck

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 134 of 1891-92

Appellant. Vs. Respondents

Santeya Rai of Gangavalli Taluk Tarikere represented by Mr Venkatesamaya Advocate

1. Ramachandrappa
2. Dattappa, father of the first Respondent

Decision. dated 24th May 1893.

This is virtually an appeal against the order of the Assistant Commissioner dated April 1889, but the appeal was admitted, as the Petitioner explained that he was not aware, till lately of the contents of the orders of Government passed in 1887, under which the Assistant Commissioner passed the order now appealed against.

The facts of the case are briefly as follows:—

The Appellant and the 2nd Respondent are brothers, the 2nd Respondent being the elder of the two. On the death of their father

14

In 1873, the ~~respondent~~ 2nd Respondent requested that his younger brother, the Appellant, might be appointed to the office, and the Appellant was accordingly appointed to the post in 1874. The Register of the ~~respondent~~ 2nd Respondent is in writing, and he admits that he signed the statement. In 1883, the ~~respondent~~ 2nd Respondent, requested that the office might be registered in the name of his son, the ~~first~~ 1st Respondent, and the Assistant Commissioner issued an order accordingly in 1883, but directing the Appellant to act as gumasta for the ~~first~~ 1st Respondent, as he was a minor. He issued this order with reference to the Board's Proceedings dated 6th December 1882, which laid down the principle that, when Vakils appoint gumastas for any of the villages of their circle, they are liable to be removed, at the instance of the Vakils after a service of 5 years.

In 1891, the Appellant appealed against the above order to the Revenue Commissioner, but he rejected the Appeal

on

the ground that the appeal was too late, and the present appeal is against this ~~same~~ order.

The Government states that the Revenue Proceedings of 1897 do not at all apply to the present case. ~~The~~ Appellant was not appointed as a gumasta. He has no good a right to the office as the, ~~second~~ 2nd Respondent, and he was appointed to the office unconditionally. The appointment of the ~~first~~ 1st Respondent ten years after the Appellant was appointed to the post is unjustifiable. The order issued by the Assistant Commissioner is, therefore, cancelled. The Appellant should be registered again as the Shanbhog of the village.

1 C P
1/6/93

No. 2056 dated 3/6/93 from the Dy Commr Bijapur

Received.

3/6 Chief Secretary.

To the Deputy Commissioner of Bijapur with reference to proceedings

R. 5/6

No. 3077-

8-6-93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

8- 6- 1893

Endorsement granted to Sankara Rao of Gangavalli Sowdikatti, Shimoga District

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 3077 dated 14-1-93 appealing against the Deputy Commissioner rejecting his appeal regarding the Headmanship of Gangavalli

~~Petitioner is informed that~~ Appellant's rejected to the Deputy Commissioner who has been requested to register the Appellant as the Shanbhog of the village.

The enclosures are returned

ccl
16/93

"By Order"

Redraft

for Chief Secretary.
3/6

S.V.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ/ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ/ಸಿಆರ್/ಸಿಆರ್-೨೨೯/೨೦೨೨-೨೩

ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳ ಗೌಪ್ಯ ವರದಿ ಬರೆಯುವ ಅವಧಿ ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆ ಕುರಿತು.

ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳ ಗೌಪ್ಯ ವರದಿ ಬರೆಯುವ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ೨೦೨೨-೨೩ನೇ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೨೦೨೨-೨೩ನೇ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳ ಗೌಪ್ಯ ವರದಿ ಬರೆಯುವ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ೨೦೨೩ರ ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೨೧ರಿಂದ ೨೦೨೩ರ ಜೂನ್ ೩೦ರವರೆಗೆ ವಿಸ್ತರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ಆದೇಶವು ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಈ ಆದೇಶವು ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಈ ಆದೇಶವು ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.